

REMARKS

Claims 17-36 are pending in the application, with claim 17 being the independent claims. Claims 17-36 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §102

Claims 17 – 27 and 29 – 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,937,189 (“Branson”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With respect to the first element of claim 17, the Examiner stated in an Office Action dated July 3, 2007 that col. 10, lines 40 – 56 teaches, “receiving from an application a request identifying an item stored in at least one database, said item having a scope that includes at least one additional item.” Applicants disagree. Col. 10, lines 40 – 56 states in part “Object Zelda uses the same interface (i.e., the check.sub.-- animals() operation) to communicate with each zoo keeper object. It is then up to the individual zoo keeper objects to perform the task for which they have been created.” According to Branson, a zoo keeper object is an instance of a class configured to perform a specific function and object Zelda is a zoo administrator object that is responsible for the overall control of ZAF, i.e., the OO framework problem domain. However this fails to teach or suggest receiving anything from an application program such as a world processor, a picture viewer, or a personal information management program.

With respect to the next element of claim 17, the Examiner stated that col. 5, lines 23 – 34 teach “generating an object that encapsulates an instance of the identified item, the encapsulation providing a method for querying the at least one database.” Applicants disagree. Col. 5, lines 23 – 34 of Branson state in part “a class can be thought of as an abstraction of the objects or as a definition of a type of object. From the view of a computer system, a single object represents an encapsulated set of data and the operation or group of operations that are performed by a computer system upon that data.” Applicants submit that there is no mention of at least a method for querying at least one database being provided by encapsulating the identified item disclosed in the cited portion of Branson.

With respect to the next element of claim 17, the Examiner stated that col. 5, lines 10 – 16, col. 10, lines 1 – 20, and col. 14, lines 30 – 45 teach “executing a query on said object for at least on additional item, the query utilizing the scope of the identified item as a parameter.” As stated above, Applicants submit that Branson fails to teach providing a query method, and there is no teaching of performing a query utilizing the scope of the identified item as a parameter. For example, col. 5 lines 10 – 16 state “[I]ike the animal mechanism, the containment unit mechanism has been designed as an extensible function such that it can handle future customization and extension requirements. Please note here, however, that even though the zoo keeper, zoo animal, and containment unit mechanism have all been designed as extensible function, the relationships between the mechanisms have been designed to be a core function of ZAF.” Nothing contained in that portion of Branson teaches using the scope of the identified item as a parameter in a query.

Col. 10, lines 1 – 20 similarly fail to teach or suggest using the scope of the identified item as a parameter in a query. In summation, this portion of Branson teaches that an object is created to be a member of a particular class, and that a zoo keeper object is responsible for overall control of a ZAF and it has a list of the current zoo keepers.

Col. 14, lines 30 – 45 similarly fail to teach or suggest using the scope of the identified item as a parameter in a query. In summation, this portion of Branson teaches that certain classes are extensible, and that classes can have relationships to each other and that classes within a certain category can invoke method provided by classes in other categories.

Finally, the Examiner stated that col. 9, lines 62 – 67 and col. 10 lines 1 – 3 teach returning to the application at least one instance of the at least one additional item that matches the query. Applicants disagree. Col. 9, lines 62 – 67 Col. 10 and lines 1 – 3 state that “[w]hen an operation of one object needs access to the data controlled by a second object, it is considered to be a client of the second object. To access the data controlled by the second object, one of the operations of the client will call or invoke one of the operations of the second object to gain access to the data controlled by that object. One of the operations of the called object (i.e., a server operation in this case) is then executed to access and/or manipulate the data controlled by the called object.” Applicants fail to see how this teaches sending anything to an application program, let alone an item that matches a query.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2733/305587.01
Application No.: 10/646,575
Office Action Dated: July 3, 2007

PATENT

Accordingly, for at least the preceding reasons, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection to claim 17.

Insomuch as claims 18 – 36 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 17 they too patentably define over the art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to claims 18 – 36.

CONCLUSION

In the view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative.

Date: October 3, 2007

/David M. Platz/
David M. Platz
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439